arXiv:1603.06276v1 [math.PR] 20 Mar 2016

The variance of the incipient infinite cluster in two-dimensional percolation

Yu Zhang

March 22, 2016

Abstract

Consider bond percolation on the square lattice. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be the incipient infinite cluster with the incipient measure ν. If a one-arm path exponent exists and equals 5/48, it is well known that $E_\nu|\mathcal{C} \cup [-n,n]^2| = n^{91/48+o(1)}$. In this paper, we focus on the variance of $|\mathcal{C} \cup [-n,n]^2|$ and show that $\sigma_\nu^2(|\mathcal{C} \cup [-n,n]^2|) = n^{91/24+o(1)}$.

1 Introduction and statement of results.

Consider bond percolation on the square lattice $\mathbf{Z}^2$. For a given $(x,y) \in \mathbf{Z}^2$, its nearest four neighbors are defined as $(x \pm 1, y)$ and $(x, y \pm 1)$. Edges between neighboring or adjacent vertices therefore correspond to vertical or horizontal displacements of one unit. Each edge is independently *open* with probability p or *closed* with probability $1-p$. The corresponding probability measure on the configurations of open and closed edges is denoted by P_p. We also denote by E_p and σ_p the expectation and the variance with respect to P_p. A path from u to v is a sequence $(v_0, e_1, v_1, ..., v_{i-1}, e_i, v_i, ..., v_n)$ with adjacent vertices v_i and v_{i+1} by edge e_i such that $v_0 = u$ and $v_n = v$. A circuit is a path with distinct vertices v_i $(1 \le i \le n-1)$ except $v_0 = v_n$. A path is called open or closed if all of its edges are open or closed. The occupied cluster of the vertex x, $\mathbf{C}(x)$, consists of all open edges that are connected to x by an open path. For any collection A of vertices, $|A|$ denotes the cardinality of A. We choose $\mathbf{0}$ as the origin.

The *percolation probability* is

$$\theta(p) = P_p(|\mathbf{C}(\mathbf{0})| = \infty),$$

and the *critical probability* is

$$p_c = \sup\{p : \theta(p) = 0\}.$$

It is well known (see chapter 3 in Kesten (1982)) that for bond percolation on the square lattice

$$p_c = 0.5. \tag{1.1}$$

It is also well known that there is no infinite open cluster at p_c. However, the mean open cluster size is infinity at p_c. In other words, there should be a large open cluster around the origin at p_c. Kesten

AMS classification: 60K35.
Key words and phrases: percolation, incipient infinite cluster, variance, critical exponents.

(1986) proposed building an infinite open cluster by conditioning on the existence of a large cluster at the origin. More precisely, for any cylinder event $\mathcal{A}$, we write

$$\nu_n(\mathcal{A}) = P_{p_c}(\mathcal{A} \mid \mathbf{0} \to \partial[-n,n]^2),$$

where $A \to B$ means that there is an open path from A to B. Kesten (1986) proved that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \nu_n(A) = \nu(A) \text{ for a cylinder event } A. \tag{1.2}$$

The probability measure ν is called the *incipient measure*. Let $E_\nu(\cdot)$ and $\sigma^2_\nu(\cdot)$ be the expected value and the variance respect with measure to ν. It is clear that the origin has ν-probability one of being in an infinite open cluster $\mathcal{C}$. Physicists are interested in the geometry of the infinite incipient cluster. They believe that $\mathcal{C}$ should have a fractal between one and two. Before introducing the geometry results for the infinite incipient cluster, we would like to introduce a few basic estimates in percolation. Let us introduce k-arm paths. Let $B(n) = [-n,n]^2$ and $B_e(n)$ be all the edges in $[-n,n]^2$. Consider the annulus

$$A(m,n) = \{B(n) \setminus B(m)\} \cup \{\partial B(m)\} \text{ for } m < n.$$

Let $\mathcal{Q}_k(b,m,n)$ be the event that there exist i disjoint occupied paths and j disjoint vacant paths with $i+j=k$ for all $i,j \geq 1$ from $b+\partial B(m)$ to $b+\partial B(n)$ inside $A(m,n)$. We call them *k-arm paths*. For simplicity, let $\mathcal{Q}_k(m,n) = \mathcal{Q}_k(\mathbf{0},m,n)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_k(n) = \mathcal{Q}_k(\mathbf{0},0,n)$. It is believed by Aizenman, Dulpantier, and Alharony (1999) that

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{Q}_k(m,n)) = \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{(k^2-1)/12+o(1)} \tag{1.3}$$

for $k \geq 2$ and

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{Q}_1(m,n)) = \left(\frac{m}{n}\right)^{5/48+o(1)} \tag{1.4}$$

for a fixed m as $n \to \infty$. In fact, it is more important to show (1.3) when $k=4$. Fortunately, by using the Schramm-Loewner evolution (SLE) argument and Smirnov's scaling limit on the triangular lattice, (1.3) and (1.4) were proved (see Lawler, Schramm, and Werner (2002) for $k=1$ and Smirnov and Werner's Theorem 4 (2001) for $k=4$). Let $T_n = |\mathcal{C} \cap [-n,n]^2|$. One of most important questions is to ask what the fractal of T_n is. With (1.4), Kesten (1987) showed that

$$E_\nu T_n = n^{2-5/48+o(1)} = n^{91/48+o(1)}. \tag{1.5}$$

In this paper, we investigate the variance of T_n to show the following result.

Theorem. *For each n, if (1.4) holds, then*

$$\sigma^2_\nu(T_n) = n^{91/24+o(1)}.$$

Remarks. 1. By Kesten's argument in (1986) (see (2.1) below), we know that

$$E_\nu T_n^2 = n^{91/24+o(1)}. \tag{1.6}$$

Thus, $\sigma_\nu^2(T_n) \approx E_\nu T_n^2$. This tells us that T_n has a very large variance as the same order as its second moments. In other words, T_n has a very large tail.
2. We may define S_n be the number of vertices in $B(n)$ connecting to $\partial B(2n)$ by open paths. By (1.4), it is easy to obtain that

$$E_{p_c}(S_n) = n^{2-5/48+o(1)}.$$

Similarly, by Kesten's argument above, it can be show that

$$E_{p_c} S_n^2 = n^{4-5/24+o(1)} = n^{91/24+o(1)}.$$

We want to mention that by using the same proof of Theorem 1, we can also show that

$$\sigma_{p_c}^2(S_n) = n^{4-5/24+o(1)} = n^{91/24+o(1)}. \tag{1.7}$$

If $p > p_c$, then there is an infinite open cluster from the origin with a positive probability. On the existence of this cluster, we may still denote by T_n the open cluster from the origin inside $B(n)$. By Theorem 4 in Zhang (2001),

$$\sigma_p^2(T_n) \approx n.$$

Furthermore, T_n satisfies the central limit theorem (CLT) if $p > p_c$. However, since T_n has a large tail, we do not think that T_n satisfies the CLT at p_c.
3. For the triangular lattice, since (1.4) holds as we mentioned above, the result of the theorem will hold for the triangular lattice. Similarly, if (1.4) holds for the other two-dimensional lattices, we can also show the theorem for these lattices.

2 Preliminaries.

In this section, we introduce a few basic properties and estimates of bond percolation in the square lattice. Most results are obtained from Kesten (1982) and (1987). For any $u, v \in \mathbf{Z}^2$, let $d(u, v)$ be the Euclidean distance between u and v. We define the dual lattice $\mathbf{Z}^{*2} = \{v + (0.5, 0.5) : v \in \mathbf{Z}^2\}$ and edges joining all pairs of vertices, which are a unit distance apart. For each edge set A, we may denote by A^* its dual edges. For example, e^* is bisected by the edge e. Given a finite connected graph G, a vertex $u \notin G$, but is adjacent to G, is called the *boundary* of G. We denote by ∂G the boundary vertices of G. If a vertex $v \in \Delta G$, and there is an infinite path from v without using G, then v is called the *exterior boundary*. We denote by ΔG the exterior boundary of G. The edges not in G, but adjacent to ΔG, are called the exterior edges. We introduce a topology result (see Lemma 2.23 in Kesten (1982) or Proposition 11.2 in Grimmett (1999)).

Lemma 2.1. *If G is a finite cluster, then ΔG is a circuit containing G in its interior. Furthermore, ΔG is the smallest vacant circuit containing G in its interior if G is occupied.*

At p_c, by symmetry, we can show that there is an open crossing or a closed dual crossing in any square with a positive probability at p_c. We can also extend this crossing two times longer with a positive probability by using the RSW lemma. Together with the FKG inequality, we can show that there is an

open or closed dual circuit with a positive probability in any annulus $A(n, 2n)$. We still call this argument the RSW lemma.

By using (43)–(53) in Kesten (1986), we know that for any $l \geq 1$ there exists $C = C(l) > 0$ such that

$$E_\nu T_n^l \leq C(E_\nu T_n)^l = n^{l(2-5/48+o(1))}. \tag{2.1}$$

Similarly, by the exact proof in Kesten's above estimate, we still have

$$E_{p_c} S_n^l \leq C(E_{p_c} S_n)^l = n^{l(2-5/48+o(1))}. \tag{2.2}$$

By (2.2) and Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, we have the followng lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive constant C_1 independent of n such that*

$$P_{p_c}(S_n \geq n^{2-5/48-\epsilon}) \geq C_1.$$

Given four-arm paths in a square $B(n)$ and four-arm paths in an annulus $A(n, m)$ for $n < m$, one of the major estimates (see Lemma 4 and Lemma 6 in Kesten (1987)) is to reconnect them by costing a constant probability independent of n and m. It is a more general argument than the RSW lemma since the RSW lemma only reconnects the open or closed paths. This connection is called the *reconnection lemma*.

Reconnection lemma. (Kesten (1987)). *For $n \leq m$, there exists $C > 0$ (independent of n, m) such that*

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{Q}_4(n) P_p(\mathcal{Q}_4(n, m))) \leq C P_{p_c}(\mathcal{Q}_4(m)).$$

In fact, in Kesten's reconnection lemma, if there are four-arm paths, then we can restrict the four-arm paths in special locations. More precisely, we denote by $\mathcal{E}_4(k)$ the event that there are four-arm paths from some edge e and e^* in $B(2^{k-1})$ to $\partial B(2^k)$. We define the sub-event $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(2^k)$ of $\mathcal{E}_4(2^k)$ such that there are four-arm paths r_1, r_2^*, r_3, and r_4^* from e and e^* in $\mathcal{E}_4(2^k)$ with (see Fig. 1)

$$\begin{aligned}
&r_1 \cap A(2^{k-1}, 2^k) \subset \mathbf{A}_1 := [-2^k, -2^{k-1}] \times [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}],\\
&r_3 \cap A(2^{k-1}, 2^k) \subset \mathbf{A}_3 := [2^{k-1}, 2^k] \times [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}],\\
&r_2^* \cap A(2^{k-1}, 2^k) \subset \mathbf{A}_2 := [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}] \times [2^{k-1}, 2^k],\\
&r_4^* \cap A(2^{k-1}, 2^k) \subset \mathbf{A}_4 := [-2^{k-1}, 2^{k-1}] \times [-2^k, -2^{k-1}].
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, we require that there exist an open vertical crossing on $\mathbf{A}_i$ for $i = 1, 3$ and a horizontal vacant dual crossing on $\mathbf{A}_i^*$ for $i = 2, 4$. These extra vertical and horizontal crossings are called *wings*. Kesten's Lemma 4 (see Kesten (1987)) showed that there exists $C > 0$ such that for all k,

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{E}_4(2^k)) \leq C P_{p_c}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(2^k)). \tag{2.3}$$

Here we want to remark that Kesten's proof in (2.3) is for four-arm paths from a fixed edge. However, the exact proof can show our situation.

It is also easier to handle a one arm path in this way. We may replace $\mathcal{E}_4(k)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(k)$ with $\mathcal{E}_1(k)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_1(k)$ by ignoring the paths r_2^*, r_3, and r_4^*. We can use the same argument of (2.3) to show that

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{E}_1(2^k)) \le CP_{p_c}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}_1(2^k)). \tag{2.4}$$

For $n < m$, we also define $\mathcal{G}_1(k)$ to be the event that there is an open path r_1 from the origin to $\partial B(2^k)$. In addition, let $\bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(k)$ be the sub-event of $\mathcal{G}_1(k)$ such that r_1 also crosses $\mathbf{A}_1$ vertically. It also follows from the same argument of (2.4) that

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{G}_1(2^k)) \le CP_{p_c}(\bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(2^k)). \tag{2.5}$$

We want to point out that the proof of (2.5) can be shown directly by using the FKG inequality and the RSW lemma since we only need to deal with open paths, positive events. The proofs of Kesten's Lemma 4 is much more complicated since they need to deal with both open and closed paths, positive and negative events.

For each $e \in B(n)$ with two vertices $v' = v'(e)$ and $v'' = v''(e)$, e is called a *pivotal* for the connection of $v'(e)$ and the origin if there is or isn't an open path inside B(n) from $v'(e)$ to the origin if e is open or closed. By Lemma 2.1, it is easy to verify that if e is pivotal, then there is a dual path $D^*(v')$ from one vertex of e^* to the other inside $B(n)$ such that all of its edges, except e^* and its edges on $\partial B(n)$, are closed, and there is an open path from $v''(e)$ to the origin (see Fig. 2). Together with e^*, $D^*(v') \cup e^*$ is a circuit, and the circuit separates $v'(e)$ from $v''(e)$. Note that there might be many such circuits. We always select one containing the smallest number of edges. It follows from Lemma 2.1 (see Fig. 2) that $D(v')$ is the exterior boundary of the open cluster of $v'(e)$. We denote by $\bar{D}(v')$ the open cluster of $v'(e)$. Let $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e)$ be the event that e is pivotal for $v'(e)$, and $D^*(v')$ does not contain the edges in $\partial B^*(n)$, and $|B(n) \cap \bar{D}(v')| \ge n^{2-5/48-\epsilon}$. Note that e can be either open or closed independent of $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e)$. On $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e)$, if e is changed from open to closed, then $\mathcal{C}$ will lose at least $n^{2-5/48-\epsilon}$ many vertices.

Lemma 2.3. *If $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon = \cup_{e\in B(n)}\mathcal{H}(e)$, then for each $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $C > 0$ (independent of ϵ and n) such that*

$$P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon) \ge C.$$

In addition, there exists a constant C_i for $i = 1, 2$ such that

$$0.5P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e)) = P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e),\ e \text{ is open}) = P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e),\ e \text{ is closed}).$$

Proof. We focus on $S = [n/16, 3n/16]^2$. Let v be the center of S. By using the RSW lemma, there exists an edge e in $v + [n/8, n/8]^2$ such that $\mathcal{E}_4(v, n/8)$ occurs with a positive probability, where $\mathcal{E}_4(v, n/8)$ is the same event $\mathcal{E}_4(n/8)$ by shifting each configuration from the origin to v. That is,

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{E}_4(v, n/8)) \ge C_1. \tag{2.6}$$

In fact, Kesten, Sidoravicius, and Zhang (1998) can show that there exist five-arm paths with a positive probability. By (2.4), we have

$$P_{p_c}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(v, n/8)) \ge C_1. \tag{2.7}$$




Figure 1: *The figure shows how to construct a few events together such that $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon$ occurs. $\mathcal{N}(\Gamma)$ is all vertices in $[5n/16, 7n/16] \times [n/16, 3n/16]$ such that each of them is connected to Γ by an open path. $\mathcal{E}_4(v, n/8)$ is the event that there are four-arm paths from e and these closed paths have two wings.*

Here we only need the closed wings in $\mathbf{A}_2$ and $\mathbf{A}_4$. On $\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(v, n/8)$, we define the following events (see Fig. 1). Let $\mathcal{D}_1(n)$ be the event that there is a closed dual path from $[n/16, 3n/16] \times \{3n/16\}$ to $[n/16, 3n/16] \times \{n/16\}$ inside annulus

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = [n/16, 11n/16] \times [-3n/16, 7n/16] \setminus [3n/16, 9n/16] \times [-n/16, 5n/16].$$

Let $\mathcal{D}_2(n)$ be the event that there is an open circuit in annulus

$$\mathbf{B}_2 = [3n/16, 9n/16] \times [-n/16, 5n/16] \setminus [5n/16, 7n/16] \times [n/16, 3n/16].$$

On $\mathcal{D}_2(n)$, there might be many such circuits. We assume that $D_2(n)$ is the largest circuit among all the circuits. By Proposition 2.3 in Kesten (1982), if $D_2(n) = \Gamma$ for a fixed circuit Γ, then

$$\text{configurations of edges inside } \dot{\Gamma} \text{ and outside } \dot{\Gamma} \text{ are independent,} \tag{2.8}$$

where $\dot{\Gamma}$ is the edges enclosed by Γ, but not in Γ. On $D_2(n) = \Gamma$ for a fixed Γ, let $\mathcal{N}(\Gamma)$ be the event that there are more than $n^{2-5/48-\epsilon}$ many vertices inside $[5n/16, 7n/16] \times [n/16, 3n/16]$ such that each is connected to Γ by open paths. Let $\mathcal{N}(D_2(n)) = \cup_\Gamma \mathcal{N}(\Gamma)$. By Lemma 2.2, there exists $C_2 > 0$ such that

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{N}(\Gamma) \mid D_2(n) = \Gamma) \geq P_{p_c}(S_{n/8} \geq n^{5/48-\epsilon}) \geq C_2. \tag{2.9}$$

Let $\mathcal{G}_2(n)$ be the event that there is an open vertical crossing in $[-n/16, n/16] \times [n/16, n]$. Let $\mathcal{D}_3(n)$ be the event that there is an open circuit in the annulus $A(11n/16, n)$, and let $\mathcal{G}(n, m)$ be the event that

there is an open path from $B(11n/16)$ to $\partial B(m)$. Now we put these events together. For any $\delta > 0$, we take m large such that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon) = \lim_{m\to\infty} P_{p_c}^{-1}(\mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)) P_{p_c}(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon \cap \mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)) \\ \geq\ & P_{p_c}^{-1}(\mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)) P_{p_c}(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon \cap \mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)) - \delta. \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

Let us focus on $P_{p_c}(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon \cap \mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m))$. As we defined these events (see Fig. 1),

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{p_c}(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon \cap \mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)) \\ \geq\ & P_{p_c}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(n/8) \cap \mathcal{D}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \mathcal{N}(D_2(n)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

Note that open paths and closed paths are positive and negative events, so by Lemma 3 in Kesten (1987),

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{p_c}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(n/8) \cap \mathcal{D}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \mathcal{N}(D_2(n)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m)) \\ \geq\ & P_{p_c}(\bar{\mathcal{E}}_4(n/8)) P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \mathcal{N}(D_n(n)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.12}$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 \cap \mathcal{D}_3 \cap \mathcal{N}(D_2) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n)$ occur in different areas (see Fig. 1), so by (2.7) together with the RSW lemma,

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \mathcal{N}(D_n(n)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m)) \\ \geq\ & C P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \mathcal{N}(D_n(n)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

By (2.9),

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \mathcal{N}(D_n(n)) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m)) \\ =\ & \sum_\Gamma P_{p_c}(\mathcal{N}(\Gamma) \mid D_2(n) = \Gamma) P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m) \cap \{D_2(n) = \Gamma\}) \\ \geq\ & C_2 \sum_\Gamma P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2 \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m) \cap \{D_2(n) = \Gamma\}) \\ \geq\ & C_2 P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m) \cap \mathcal{D}_2(n)), \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where the sum takes over all possible edge sets Γ. By the FKG inequality, the RSW lemma, and (2.5),

$$P_{p_c}(\mathcal{D}_3(n) \cap \bar{\mathcal{G}}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}_2(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m) \cap \mathcal{D}_2(n)) \geq C_3 P_{p_c}(\mathcal{G}_1(n) \cap \mathcal{G}(n,m)) \geq C_3 P_{p_c}(\mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)). \tag{2.15}$$

If we put (2.11)–(2.15) together, then

$$P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon) \geq C_3 - \delta. \tag{2.16}$$

Since δ can be arbitrarily small, the first inequality in Lemma 2.3 follows.

Let us show the second inequities in Lemma 2.3. By using Lemma 2.11, we can show that

$$P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e), e \text{ is open/closed}) = \lim_{m\to\infty} P_{p_c}^{-1}(\mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)) P_{p_c}(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e), e \text{ is open/closed}, \mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)). \tag{2.17}$$

Note that the open path from the origin to $\partial B(m)$ will not use e, so the configuration of e is open or closed independent of $\{\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(e) \cap \mathbf{0} \to \partial B(m)\}$. Thus, the second inequality in Lemma 2.3 follows from (2.17). □

3 A martingale construction for T_n.

The martingale construction has been used to estimate the variance of an open cluster in super-critical percolation (see Zhang 2001). As we know, super-critical percolation does not have two large open clusters, so it can use the edge-to-edge martingale construction. However, there might be two large open clusters at the criticality. Thus, we need a much more complicated martingale construction. We order the edges of $B(n)$ in the following way. First, we order the edges in $B(1)$ in a certain order. For example, we can do it by spiral order. Suppose that we order the edges in $B(i)$; then we can order the edges $B(i+1) \setminus B(i)$ in a certain order. Thus, we order all edges in $B(n)$ by $\{e_1, e_2, \cdots, e_i, e_{i+1}, \cdots, e_m\}$. Our probability space is $\Omega = \{0,1\}^m$, where m is the number of edges in $B(n)$ and, the generic point of Ω is $\{\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_m\}$. In configuration ω, the state of e_k is $\omega(e_k) = \omega_k$, where random variable ω_k takes value zero or one if the edge is open or closed. Note that T_n is defined on the configuration of open and closed edges in $[-n, n]^2$. If we change the open edge by zero and the closed edge by one, then we can define $T_n(\omega)$ for $\omega \in \Omega$. In particular, if the edges in $B(n)$ are divided into two sub-edge sets $B_1 \cup B_2$, then we can write $\omega = (\omega(B_1), \omega(B_2))$ and $T_n(\omega) = T_n(\omega(B_1), \omega(B_2))$.

For e_k, recall that we considered its two vertices v'_k and v''_k in the last section. We also let $D^*(v'_k)$ be the exterior boundary of the open cluster of v' inside $B(n)$ separating v'_k from v''_k (see Fig. 2). We call e_k the pivotal in the connection of v'_k and the origin. Now we construct random sets for each e_k. If e_k is a pivotal edge, then let W_k be the edge set enclosed by $D(v'_k) \cup e_k$, including the boundary edges. We also call e_k the pivotal edge of W_k. Note that e_k can be open or closed. If e_k is open or closed, we denote in particular by W_k^+ or by W_k^- for W_k. If e_k is not a pivotal edge, we simply denote by $W_k = e_k$. Note that if both W_i and W_j are non-single edge sets, then the open clusters inside W_i and W_j cannot have a common vertex. We call this the *disjoint property*. We start e_1 to construct W_1. Suppose that $\{W_{j_1}, \cdots, W_{j_t}\}$ is defined by following the edge order: $\{e_1, \cdots, e_m\}$. Suppose that these edges are

$$\{e_{i_1}, e_{i_1+1}, \cdots, e_{i_1+l_1}, e_{i_2}, e_{i_2+1}, \cdots, e_{i_2+l_2}, \cdots, e_{i_k}, e_{i_k+1}, \cdots, e_{i_k+l_k}\}$$

for $i_j + l_j < i_{j+1}$. Then we consider $e_{i_1+l_1+1}$ and the random set $W_{i_1+l_1+1}$. We add this random set $W_{i_1+l_1+1}$ to have $\{W_{j_1}, \cdots, W_{j_t}, W_{j_{t+1}}\}$. If we continue this way by following the edges $\{e_1, \cdots, e_m\}$, we will construct all edge sets in $B(n)$. Without loss of generality, we still denote them by $\{W_1, W_2, \cdots, W_m\}$ (see Fig. 2). Note that if W_k is not a single edge with the pivotal edge e, then $D^*(v')$ exists as the exterior boundary of the open cluster, denoted by $\bar{D}(v')$ of $v'(e)$. We say random set W_k satisfies the *bubble condition* if it indeed consists of the edge set enclosed by $D^*(v'_k) \cup e_k^*$ together with $D(v'_k) \cup e_k$. For given sets $\{V_1, \cdots, V_t\}$, we may consider the event $\{W_1 = V_1, \cdots, W_t = V_t\}$. It follows from our construction that

$$\{W_1 = V_1, \cdots, W_t = V_t\} \text{ and } \{W_1 = V'_1, \cdots, W_t = V'_t\} \text{ are disjoint if } V_j \neq V'_j \text{ for some } j \leq t. \quad (3.1)$$

In other words, this construction is unique for each configuration of open and closed edges in $B(n)$. We call this set structure the *spiral bubble* structure.

Note that W_k is a random set, so we use $\omega(W_k)$ to represent the configuration of Ω such that each open or closed edge in W_k is changed to be zero or one. Now we will construct the following martingale sequence with these sets $\{W_1, W_2, \cdots, W_m\}$. Let filtration




Figure 2: *The figure shows how to construct random sets* $\{W_l\}$ *by following the order* $\{e_0, \cdots, e_m\}$. $W_1, W_2, \cdots, W_{i-1}$ *are single edge sets, until we reach the first edge* e_i *with the vertices* v_i' *and* v_i'' *such that* v_i' *is enclosed by a closed dual path* $D^*(v_i') \cup e_i^*$, *indicted by* $*$*-edges, and* v_i'' *is connected to the origin by an open path. Note that* $D^*(v_i')$ *(together with two edges in the boundary) is a dual circuit separating* v_i' *from* v_i''. *We add these edges enclosed by* $D^*(v_i') \cup e_i^*$ *together with its boundary edges to have* W_i. *In this case, we denote it by* W_i^- *since* e_i *is closed. We continue to have single edge sets until reaching* e_j *for* $j > i$ *such that edge* e_j *also satisfies the above condition, but with open* e_j. *We then add these edges enclosed by* $D^*(v_j') \cup e_j^*$ *together with their boundary edges to have* W_j. *We denote it by* W_j^+. *We continue this way for all the edges in* $B(n)$. *All the solid-circled edges are open, and all the* $*$*-dual edges are closed.*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_0 &= \text{ the trivial } \sigma\text{-field } = \{\emptyset, \Omega\}.\\ \mathcal{F}_k &= \text{ the } \sigma\text{-field generated by } \{\omega(e) : e \in \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i\} \text{ for } 0 \le k \le m.\end{aligned}$$

More precisely, $\mathcal{F}_k$ is the smallest σ-field that contains all the sets with the form

$$\{\omega \in \Omega : \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i = \{e_{j_1}, e_{j_2}, \cdots, e_{j_t}\} \text{ for } (\omega(e_{j_1}), \cdots, \omega(e_{j_t})) \in \mathbf{B}\},$$

where $\mathbf{B}$ is an i-dimensional Borel set. If $k > m$, we simply define that

$$\mathcal{F}_k = \mathcal{F}_m.$$

Note that $\cup_{i\le k} W_i \subset \cup_{i\le k+1} W_i$, so

$$\mathcal{F}_0 \subset \mathcal{F}_1 \subset \cdots \subset \mathcal{F}_k \subset \cdots.$$

Thus, $\{\mathcal{F}_0, \cdots, \mathcal{F}_k, \cdots\}$ is a filtration constructed by random sets $\{W_1, \cdots, W_m\}$. With these σ-fields, the martingale representation of $T_n - E_\nu T_n$ is

$$T_n - E_\nu T_n = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \left[E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_k) - E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1})\right]. \tag{3.2}$$

Thus,

$$\{M_k = E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_k) - E_\nu T_n\}$$

defined an $\mathcal{F}_k$-martingale sequence. The martingale difference is defined by

$$\Delta_{k,n} = M_k - M_{k-1}.$$

It follows from the martingale property that

$$T_n - E_\nu T_n = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \Delta_{k,n} \text{ and } \sigma_\nu(T_n)^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{m} E_\nu \Delta_{k,m}^2. \tag{3.3}$$

Let us carefully analyze the martingale difference $\{\Delta_{k,n}\}$. By our definition, $E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_k)$ is $\mathcal{F}_k$ measurable. For a set Γ_k, let $\omega(\Gamma_k)$ and $c(\Gamma_k)$ be a random configuration set and a fixed configuration set, respectively. Thus, we may regard $E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_k)$ as a random variable on random set $\cup_{i\le k} W_i = \Gamma_k$. For a random configuration $\omega(\Gamma_k) = \omega(\cup_{i\le k} W_i)$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_k) &= \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)} T_n(\omega(\Gamma_k), c(B_e(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)) P_\nu(c(B_e(n)\setminus\Gamma_k))\\ &= \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus\cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n\left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k} W_i), c(B_e(n)\setminus\bigcup_{i\le k} W_i)\right) P_\nu\left(c(B_e(n)\setminus\bigcup_{i\le k} W_i)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where B_e is the edge set in $[-n, n]^2$ and

$$P_\nu(c(B_e(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)) = P_\nu(\omega(B_e(n)\setminus\Gamma_k) = c(B_e(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)),$$

and the sum takes all configurations $c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i)$. By this definition, we show the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *For any random set $\Gamma_k = \cup_{i\le k} W_i$ constructed in the spiral bubble structure,*

$$\sum_{c(B(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)} P_\nu(c(B(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)) = 1. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. For $\Gamma_k = \cup_{i\le k} W_i$, let $I(\omega(\Gamma_k))$ be the indicator for the configuration of $\omega(\Gamma_k)$. Thus,

$$E_\nu(E_\nu(I(\omega(\Gamma_k)) \mid \mathcal{F}_k)) = E_\nu I(\omega(\Gamma_k)). \tag{3.6}$$

Note that $I(\omega(\Gamma_k))$ is $\mathcal{F}_k$-measurable, so if we suppose that

$$\sum_{c(B(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)} P_\nu(c(B(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)) < 1,$$

then

$$E_\nu(E_\nu(I(\omega(\Gamma_k)) \mid \mathcal{F}_k)) = E_\nu I(\omega(\Gamma_k) \left(\sum_{c(B(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)} P_\nu(c(B(n)\setminus\Gamma_k)) \right) < E_\nu(I(\omega(\Gamma_k)). \tag{3.7}$$

The contradiction of (3.6) and (3.7) shows that Lemma 3.1 holds. □

4 Proof of theorem.

4.1 A lower bound estimate of the theorem.

For a given $\epsilon > 0$, we may decompose $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon$ defined in Lemma 2.3 into $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t) \subset \mathcal{H}_\epsilon$ with the first k, by following the order $e_0, \cdots, e_m$, such that $D^*(v'_k)$ contains its open cluster $\bar{D}^*(v'_k)$ with t vertices larger than $n^{2-5/4-\epsilon}$, where v'_k and v''_k are the two vertices of e_k. Thus,

$$\mathcal{H}_\epsilon = \bigcup_k \bigcup_t \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t).$$

By Lemma 2.3, note that $\{\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)\}$ are disjoint in t and k, so there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon) = \sum_k \sum_t P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) > C. \tag{4.1}$$

Now we choose a configuration with random set $\Gamma_k = \cup_{i\le k} W_i$ in $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)$ such that e_k is open and $W_k = D^*(v'_k)$, where $\{W_1, \cdots, W_m\}$ is constructed in the spiral bubble structure and $D^*(v'_k)$ contains the open cluster $\bar{D}^*(v'_k)$ with vertex size t larger than $n^{2-5/48-\epsilon}$. We denote by $I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k))$ the indicator of these configurations such that e_k is open and the open cluster of v' above has t vertices larger than $n^{2-5/48-\epsilon}$. We also let $I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t))$ be the indicator such that on $\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)$ the first k spiral bubble random sets are $\Gamma_k = \cup_{i\le k} W_i$. Thus,

$$I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k)) \le I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)). \tag{4.2}$$

Indeed, if $I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) = 1$, e_k may or may not be open, but e_k is open when $I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k)) = 1$. In other words, if $I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) = 1$, W_k may be W_k^+ or W_k^-, but W_k^+ has to occur when $I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k)) = 1$.

By (3.4), for this random set $\cup_{i\le k-1} W_i \cup W_k^+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_k) I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) \\
&= \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+), c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) P_\nu \left(c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right). \qquad (4.3)
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, note that on $I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t))$, W_k can only take W_k^+ or W_k^-, so by the second inequality in Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_\nu(T_n \mid \mathcal{F}_{k-1}) I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) \\
&= \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+), c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) P_\nu \left(c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i), c(W_k^+) \right) \\
&+ \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^-), c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) P_\nu \left(c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i), c(W_k^-) \right) \\
&\le \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+), c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) P_\nu \left(c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i), \omega(e_k) = 0 \right) \\
&+ \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^-), c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) P_\nu \left(c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i), \omega(e_k) = 1) \right) \\
&= 0.5 \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+), c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) P_\nu \left(c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) \\
&+ 0.5 \sum_{c(B_e(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^-), c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) P_\nu \left(c(B_e(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right). \qquad (4.4)
\end{aligned}$$

If we put (4.3) and (4.4) together, then for the random set $\Gamma_k = \bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i \cup W_k^+$ with $I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k)) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta_{k,n} \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+) \right) I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) \\
&\ge 0.5 \sum_{c(B(n)\setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)} \left[T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+), c(B(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) - T_n \left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^-), c(B(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right) \right] \\
&\quad \times P_\nu \left(c(B(n) \setminus \bigcup_{i\le k} W_i) \right). \qquad (4.5)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|\bar{D}^*(v_k')| = t \ge n^{2-5/28-\epsilon}$, so

$$T_n(\omega(\cup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+), c(B(n) \setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)) - T_n(\omega(\cup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^-), c(B(n) \setminus \cup_{i\le k} W_i)) \ge n^{2-5/48-\epsilon}. \qquad (4.6)$$

By (4.5) and (4.6), for the random set Γ_k with $I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k)) = 1$,

$$\Delta_{k,n}\left(\omega(\bigcup_{i\le k-1} W_i), \omega(W_k^+)\right) I(\Gamma_k, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) \ge 0.5n^{2-5/48-\epsilon} \sum_{c(B(n)\setminus\cup_{i\le k}W_i)} P_\nu\left(c(B(n)\setminus\bigcup_{i\le k} W_i)\right). \quad (4.7)$$

By (4.7) and Lemma 3.1, for each random set $\Gamma_k = \cup_{i\le k}W_i \in \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)$ with $I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k)) = 1$, there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\Delta^2_{k,n}(\cup_{i\le k-1}W_i \cup W_k^+) = \Delta^2_{k,n}(\omega(\Gamma_k)) \ge Cn^{4-5/24-\epsilon}. \quad (4.8)$$

Thus, for each random set $\Gamma_k = \cup_{i\le k}W_i \in \mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)$ with $I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k)) = 1$, by (4.8), note that $\{I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k))\}$ are disjoint in k, t, Γ_k, and $\omega(\Gamma_k)$, so there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\nu \sum_k \Delta^2_{k,n} &\ge E_\nu \sum_k \sum_t \sum_{\Gamma_k} \sum_{\omega(\Gamma_k)} I_t(\omega(\Gamma_k))\Delta^2_{k,n}(\omega(\Gamma_k)) \\ &\ge Cn^{4-5/24-\epsilon} E_\nu \left(\sum_k \sum_t \sum_{\Gamma_k} \sum_{\omega(\Gamma_k)} I(\omega(\Gamma_k))\right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

By (4.9),

$$E_\nu \sum_k \Delta^2_{k,n} \ge Cn^{4-5/24-\epsilon} \sum_k \sum_t E_\nu I(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon(k,t)) I(\omega(e_k) = 0). \quad (4.10)$$

By (4.10) and Lemma 2.3, there exist $C_i > 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ such that

$$E_\nu \sum_k \Delta^2_{k,n} \ge C_1 n^{4-5/24-\epsilon} P_\nu(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon) \ge C_2 n^{4-5/24-\epsilon}. \quad (4.11)$$

By (3.3) and (4.11), note that ϵ can be arbitrarily small, so the lower bound in the theorem satisfies that

$$\sigma^2(T_n) \ge n^{4-5/24+o(1)}. \quad (4.12)$$

4.2 An upper bound estimate of the theorem.

By (2.1), the upper bound in the theorem satisfies that

$$\sigma^2(T_n) \le E_\nu(T_n)^2 \le C(E_\nu T_n)^2 \le n^{4-5/24+o(1)}. \quad (4.13)$$

References

Aizenman, M., Dulpantier, B. and Alharony, A. (1999). Path-crossing exponents and the external perimeter in 2D percolation. *Phy. Rev. Lett.* **63**, 817–835.

Grimmett, G. (1999). *Percolation.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

Kesten, H. (1982). *Percolation Theory for Mathematicians.* Birkhauser, Boston.

Kesten, H. (1986). The incipient infinite cluster in two-dimensional percolation *Probab. Theory Related. Fields* **73**, 369–394.

Kesten, H. (1987). Scaling relations for 2D-percolation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **109**, 109–156.

Kesten, H., Sidoravicius, V. and Zhang, Y. (1998). Almost all words are seen in critical site percolation on the triangular lattice. *Electron. J. Probab.* **3** no. 10, 75pp.

Lawler, G. F., Schramm, O. and Werner, W. (2002). One-arm exponent for critical 2D percolation. *Electron. J. Probab.* **7**, 13pp.

Smirnov, S. (2001). Critical percolation in the plane: conformal invariance, Cardy's formula, scaling limits. *CR. Acad. Sci. I-Math.* **333**, 239–244.

Smirnov, S. and Werner, W. (2001). Critical exponent for two dimensional percolation. *Math. Res. Lett.* **8**, 729–744.

Zhang, Y. (2001). A martingale approach in the study of percolation clusters on the $\mathbf{Z}^d$ lattice. *J. Theoret Probab.* **14**, 165–187.

Yu Zhang
Department of Mathematics
University of Colorado, Colorado Springs
CO 80918 USA
yzhang3@uccs.edu